

REMARKS

By the present amendment, applicant has cancelled claims 24-42 and has amended claim 22 to include all the important steps of applicant's method.

The Examiner's rejection of the original claims under 35 USC §102 or 103 for being anticipated by the Rohrbaugh et al. published US application no. 2002/0045010 or unpatentable over Rohrbaugh et al. in view of Kuchinski et al. US Patent No. 6001494, the Boire US Patent No. 6103363, the Hanson US Patent No. 4267209, the Tsujimichi et al. US patent publication no. 2001/0036897 and the Kamen et al. US Patent No. 5585153, as these rejections may be attempted to be applied to amended claim 22, are respectfully traversed.

In support of this traverse, it is first of all pointed out that, as admitted by the Examiner, that Rohrbaugh et al. and the other references do not teach applicant's method.

The Examiner states that the other references teach similar or analogous steps or steps equivalent to applicant's method steps and similar or analogous or equivalent materials to applicant's materials. However these references do not establish solid evidence to support the Examiner's rejections.

Further, it appears that the Examiner would be using impermissible hindsight in attempting to draw a mosaic of allegedly similar or allegedly equivalent materials or steps from 6 disparate references to reject applicant's amended claim 22. This is clearly improper.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that claim 22 now pending in the subject application is clear of the art of record and otherwise in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

February 12, 2008
Chicago, IL 60601
221 N. LaSalle Street
Room 2036
(312) 236 8123

Pyle & Piontek, LLC

By Thomas R. Vigil
Thomas R. Vigil
Registration No. 24,542
Customer No. 66919